UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,338	02/21/2006	Sean Kelly	16679.1	5297

22913   7590   01/09/2008
WORKMAN NYDEGGER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
WILLIAMS, CLAYTON R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 February 2006_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are pending in the application.
       4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _21 February 2006_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
       Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
       Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
       a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
       * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
       Paper No(s)/Mail Date _21 February 2006_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
       Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

Specification

2.   The claim of priority of the PCT in the specification is objected to for failure to

disclose the filing date of Australian provisional patent application no. 2003904507.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Herrero, US 2002/0078007 (hereinafter Herrero). Herrero is cited by

applicant in IDS filed 2/21/2006.

For claim 1, Herrero teaches:

A system for enabling a user to create at least one task (Abstract), the system

comprising:

a host server for hosting task pages once they have been created ([0029], lines

2-6, a host computer 110 and its associated database server 118 and web server

116 are disclosed);

at least one user computer running a browser program operable by at least one

user to access task pages hosted by said host server that said at least one user

has permission to access ([0030], browsers 126-128 access host computer 110

for purpose of manipulating and interacting with to-do lists); and

a task creator configured to create a task record in response to a command from

an initiating user, the task record including a task universal resource indicator

(uri) for each new task whereby said host server can create a task page from

said task record that can be accessed using said task uri ([0040], options menu

410 allows user to add/edit projects whose properties are stored on host

computer 110).

For claim 2, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said system comprises a plurality of

user computers ([0030], lines 1-2, browsers 126-128).

For claim 3, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 2, wherein said task creator is configured to allow the initiating user to specify at least one additional user for a task and to create an association record specifying the initiating user and any additional users specified by the initiating user, the association record defining the users who have permission to access the task page ([0051], disclosure of user creating tasks at step 340 and selecting users, i.e. contacts, to associate with this task at step 342).

For claim 4, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the task creator is configured to dispatch a message including the task uri to the at least one additional user to thereby inform the at least one additional user of the task whereafter the at least one additional user can access said task page using a browser program run by the additional user's user computer ([0035], host computer 110 keeps users apprised through messages sent via a variety of means).

For claim 5, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 4, comprising e-mail messaging means whereby the message dispatched is an e- mail message ([0035], host computer disclosed to send messages via mail server 122).

For claim 6, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 4, comprising SMS messaging means whereby the message dispatched is an SMS message ([0035], host computer disclosed to send messages via wireless means to devices such as cell phones).

For claim 7, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the task creator is a task creation program run by said host server which is operable using the browser program run by the initiating user's user computer ([0030], host computer 110 maintains a to-do list which is accessible via browser by browsers 126-128).

For claim 8, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said task creator allows an initiating user to add at least one subject uri of at least one subject page to the task record, whereafter the task page includes the at least one subject uri whereby users can access the subject page from the task page ([0031], lines 1-8, disclosure of items (tasks) being associated with a project, as well as disclosure of items being presented in sorted form from within browser).

For claim 9, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein a task creation uri is placed on a subject page and the initiating user sends a command to said task creator by selecting the task creation uri whereafter the task creator creates a task record including the uri of the

subject uri ([0040], disclosure of interface 400 allowing for creation of tasks and

projects).

For claim 11, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a task creation uri stored in a

uri record of an initiating user's browser, whereby when viewing a subject page an

initiating user sends a command to said task creator by selecting the task creation uri

from the uri record whereafter the task creator creates a task record including the

subject uri ([0031], lines 1-4, disclosure of system allowing user, via browser interface,

to add to-do items, i.e. subjects, to a task, i.e. project).

For claim 14, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising an event creator for creating

events associated with a task ([0031], lines 1-4).

For claim 15, Herrero teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 14, wherein an event may be created from the task

page ([0040], lines 1-4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Herrero, as applied to claim 1, in view of Taylor et al., US 5,754,306 (hereinafter

Taylor).

For claim 10, Herrero teaches:

        "A system as claimed in claim 9"

Herrero fails to disclose the limitation "further comprising automatically adding an

additional user to the task record"

        However, Taylor discloses an email communication system that automatically fills

in default values for recipients after a user creates an email. (col. 13, lines 61-62).

Herrero and Taylor are analogous art because both are from the field of user

communication across a network

        It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the teachings of Herrero with a method of filling default values for

recipients/community members, as taught by Taylor, because this modification allows

for increased productivity and less repetitive steps in issuing postings to a project

management site.

7.   Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Herrero, as applied to claim 1, in view of Vogt et al., US 7,159,178 (hereinafter Vogt).

For claim 12, Herrero teaches:

"A system as claimed in claim 1".

Herrero fails to disclose the limitation "wherein said host server hosts a home page for

each user."

However, Vogt discloses a communication system for managing a community of

participants (Abstract) that presents each user with a personalized webpage that

displays items such as communities of which the user is a member (col. 7, lines 6-12).

Herrero and Vogt are analogous art because both are from the field of

community/project management.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the teachings of Herrero with a virtual community communications system that

presents personalized webpages, as taught by Vogt, because this modification allows

community participants to more readily share and access their own and others

contributions (Vogt, col. 2, lines 3-9).

For claim 13, the combination of Herrero and Vogt teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 12, wherein said home page is configured such that users can access all tasks which they have permission to access from their respective home pages (Herrero, [0034], lines 1-3).

8.   Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrero, as applied to claim 1, in view of Buzaglo et al., US 6,058,395 (hereinafter Buzaglo).

For claim 16, Herrero discloses:

"A system as claimed in claim 1".

Herrero fails to disclose the limitation "further comprising chat means which allows users who have permission to access a task to chat to one another when they are logged onto the system at the same time."

However, Buzaglo discloses a communication system for managing a community of participants for a multidisciplinary project (Abstract) that allows a user to chat with other participants in a project who are concurrently online (col. 7, lines 57-61). Herrero and Buzaglo are both analogous art from the field of community/project management.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Herrero with a virtual community communications system including real-time chat features, as taught by Buzaglo, because this modification allows

for community participants to quickly apprise other participants of their status and to make inquiries/requests of others.

For claim 17, the combination of Herrero and Buzaglo discloses:

A system as claimed in claim 16, wherein each task page has means for initiating a chat (Buzaglo, col. 7, lines 57-61, disclosure of system providing means for initiating chat with other on-line project participants).

For claim 18, Herrero discloses:

"A system as claimed in claim 1".
Herrero fails to disclose the limitation "wherein said task creator is configured to allow specification of a lifetime for a task whereby during said lifetime a user who selects the task uri is directed immediately to the task page and outside said lifetime said user is required to confirm their identity".

However, Buzaglo discloses a communication system for managing a community of participants for a multidisciplinary project (Abstract) that allows for administrator configurable authorization schemes for project participants (col. 6, lines 41-49).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Herrero with a virtual community communications system including user authorization controls, as taught by Buzaglo, because this modification allows for implementation of security controls for both the project and user accounts.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CLAYTON WILLIAMS whose telephone number is

(571)270-3801. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRW
01/04/08

/Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152